

**Greenville Intermodal
Transportation Center
Greenville, North Carolina**
MMPA Project No. 07124.00



**MOSER
MAYER
PHOENIX**
ASSOCIATES, PA

Team Visits Meeting Summaries – September 17 and 18, 2007

Meeting 1: GREAT (Greenville Area Transit)

Attendees:

Nancy Harrington	Transit Manager, GREAT
Thom Moton	Assistant City Manager, City of Greenville
Ken Jackson	Interim Director of Public Works, City of Greenville
Laird Pylkas	Wendel Duchscherer
Ken Mayer	Moser Mayer Phoenix Associates

Items Discussed:

1. The meeting opened with Ken providing a general overview of the day's objectives. The discussion then moved into more specifics concerning GREAT's programming and operations' objectives with the new transportation center.
2. There was general conversation about the possibility of providing an airport shuttle from the new transportation center (ITC).
3. Greenville currently runs thirty-five foot buses. They would like the ITC to be designed to accommodate forty foot buses. Six bays will need to be provided in the ITC for GREAT to accommodate their future growth.
4. Nancy noted that because of Greenville's geographic size and the growth patterns East, West and North, that secondary hubs will ultimately need to be established because the routes can not physically all come back to downtown for thirty minute or even one-hour service.
5. There was conversation about a shuttle bus space that could provide a spot for hotels or other transportation services to pick up passengers.
6. A downtown trolley is a possibility. The ITC would certainly be a stop on that route.
7. GREAT is looking at expanding their route hours and this will impact the operations of the ITC.
8. The existing location for GREAT's downtown hub is convenient. There is room on the street for all four buses to park and transfer passengers. Of course, there is no significant covering for inclement weather.
9. There will be interaction with the hospital system and that interaction can be a GREAT stop at the hospital as well as a PCMH shuttle bus stop at the ITC.
10. GREAT expects to move to thirty minute service and more routes in the next several years.

C O M P L E T E
F A C I L I T I E S
S O L U T I O N S

Architecture

Engineering

Interior Design

Site Services

3 2 8 E a s t
M a r k e t S t r e e t
S u i t e 2 0 0
G r e e n s b o r o
N o r t h C a r o l i n a
2 7 4 0 1

P 336.373.9800
F 336.373.0077

www.mmpa.com



11. There was significant discussion about what administrative functions should be at the ITC versus what should be at the Public Works Department where operations currently reside. The original feasibility study anticipated that GREAT's administrative offices would move to the ITC and that eventually a new maintenance facility might be developed near the ITC.
 - The current thinking, however, is that the ITC will house limited administrative space to include an office for facility manager, a workstation for administrative assistant, a meeting room which could also be a place for the transit manager to work when she is on site, storage room, housekeeping closet, small conference room which could be shared with other tenants (and might even increase in size with that sharing), a ticketing location which would be shared with Trailways and others, staff restrooms which would be shared by other staff tenants, a small breakroom to handle shift change with an ultimate capacity of twelve drivers at a given time. Meanwhile at the operations center, the transit manager's permanent office would be housed there along with an operations manager, administrative assistant and storage. Should the GREAT operations evolve at some point into a transportation authority, there will be other office and administrative space needs which could be accommodated elsewhere.
12. Parking requirements were discussed. It was felt that there was a need for five on site spaces as follows: Facility manager, ticketing staff person, administrative assistant, transit manager and a shift change space. The shift change space is to house the car that the drivers will share when one shift comes to the center to relieve another shift.
13. It was discussed that the facility manager could be the primary contact point for all calls to GREAT.
14. Thom Moton discussed the ideas of ancillary spaces in the ITC. One thought is partnering with a local organization to house the East Carolina Science Center with a need of four to six thousand square feet of space. This could be a shared use at the center.
15. Food service was also discussed and the level and type will need some additional thought.
16. Work assignments from this meeting included:
 - a. GREAT and the City of Greenville to confirm the final disposition of administrative office locations for GREAT and also to discuss if the move to an authority is something that will happen sooner than later and thus potentially impact the design of the center.
 - b. Thom Moton will have continued conversations with the Science Center to see how realistic that partnering opportunity is.

Meeting Two – Police Departments (City of Greenville and East Carolina University)

Attendees:

Joe Bartlett	Greenville Police
Thomas Forrest	Greenville Police
Janice Harris	East Carolina University Police
Nancy Harrington	Transit Manager, GREAT
Laird Pylkas	Wendel Duchscherer
Ken Mayer	MMPA

Items discussed:

1. Since the previous meetings with the Police Departments in July, the departments have had a number of meetings and have developed their specific program requirements as outlined below:
 - a. Office space covering about eight to nine hundred square feet will be needed. This is to house the operations of the downtown bike patrol as well as East Carolina's Police officers who will work in this area. The office area should be laid out to house ten workstations which will allow the twenty officers that will work out of this area to share a work space plus one workstation for "Transit Security". There will also be a supervisor's office.
 - b. Shower and locker space is needed for the officers. The shower space could be shared with other tenants in the building.
 - c. Since this is a bicycle patrol, there will need to be storage and maintenance areas for bikes. There will be twenty bicycles stored by the City plus several for East Carolina. It is anticipated that this space could be as much as 1200 sq. ft. when including the maintenance.
 - d. A break area is needed which could be shared with other staff in the building.
 - e. A small interview/holding room approximately six by six should be provided.
 - f. A location to temporarily house two portable kennels for the K9 group. These could be housed in the bicycle storage area.
 - g. The technology requirements for the police space and the building as a whole will include wireless internet, camera monitoring system and a direct building phone line for the Police so that if a passenger feels threatened or in trouble there is an immediate direct line to the Police.
 - h. A volunteer manned information station is also desired. Again this could be a function that could serve the whole building as well as be an interface point with the Police at the center.
 - i. Parking requirements either on site or immediately adjacent to the site includes spaces for three to four patrol cars and as many as fifteen to twenty spaces for officers' vehicles.
2. Work Assignments:
 - a. Nancy will contact FTA to determine how funding formulas will apply to police facilities.

Meeting Three – Pitt Area Transit System (PATs)

Attendees:

John Silverthorne	PATs Training Instructor
Phil Dickerson	Deputy Manager for Pitt County
Bob Thompson	Chairman of PATs
Nancy Harrington	Transit Manager, GREAT
Laird Pylkas	Wendel Duchscherer
Ken Mayer	Moser Mayer Phoenix Associates

Items discussed:

1. The meeting opened with a discussion of the current structure of PATS. Pitt County took over the management of PATS effective July 1, 2007 and State funding that supports PATS is generated primarily for the rural general public service that it provides. PATS also provides agency transportation (dialysis patients, counsel on aging, etc.) for agencies that have patients with specific needs. It also provides the Paratransit service for GREAT.
2. Most of the routes provided by PATS are on demand. The routes that they use to serve East Carolina Vocational Center, however, are fixed routes. The plan is to, in the future, add additional fixed routes potentially to serve communities such as Ayden and Griffin.
3. PATS currently operates seven – thirteen passenger vans. These are high-top vans. Two bays for these vans at the ITC are needed. Other ITC needs include an information kiosk (which could be a shared information desk as mentioned in other meetings), telephone capability, access to food and seating in the waiting area for six to seven people.
4. There was discussion about the approach to restroom design. Bob Thompson suggested that the restrooms be the “no door” type that is typically seen in airports and other transportation centers. This will allow much more accessibility by those physically impaired as well as less maintenance because of lack of doors, etc. He also suggested that more than the minimum number of accessible height sinks and handicap toilets be provided. Able bodied people can use accessible sinks and handicap toilets while it is difficult if not impossible for disabled to use traditional fixtures.
5. Disability as it relates to accessing vending machines was also discussed with particular focus on turn around space in front of the machines and height of various operating devices on the machines.

Meeting Four – East Carolina University Student Transit (ECUSTA)

Attendees:

Jack Tawney	Interim Director of ECU Parking
Wood Davidson	Interim Director of ECU Transit Authority
Todd Johnson	Interim Vice Provost for Student Affairs
Nancy Harrington	Transit Manager, GREAT
Laird Pylkas	Wendel Duchscherer
Ken Mayer	Moser Mayer Phoenix Associates

Items discussed:

1. The meeting opened with some general conversation about what aspects of the ITC East Carolina thought would benefit their transportation system. This primarily includes access to GREAT and Trailways as well as some limited need to access taxis. It was pointed out that the ECUSTA operates until 3:30 a.m. on some nights which would certainly impact the operating hours of the ITC if those late night routes came through the center. It was felt that student ticketing could be handled at the ITC perhaps through the central ticket access point to be provided and that brochures and schedules for the student transit system could be a part of it.

2. The number of bays that the student transit system would need at the ITC would vary depending on where the center was located in relation to the campus. If the center was east of Evans Street, it is possible that it could replace an on campus hub and four to five bays would be needed. If the ITC was located west of Evans, then perhaps as few as one bay would need to be provided at the ITC. It was pointed out that the student transit system runs eleven or more articulated buses. These are much longer than regular buses and would need to be accommodated in the center.
3. If the ITC served as one of the University's hubs, there could be a significant impact on the waiting area with as many as fifty to sixty seats. Having one of the hubs at the ITC would be an advantage for the University in that this particular location as there would be indoor and covered waiting space for those students. It would also be an easier place for buses to get in and out of. The issue of operating hours, however, given the University operates from 7:00 a.m. to 3:30 a.m. needs to be considered.
4. Todd Johnson pointed out a couple of other possibilities where the University and the ITC could partner. As mentioned in July, the ITC could function as a Welcome Center and Visitor Information Center for both the University and the City. As a part of that, some student related services could be provided at the center such as the Office of Off Campus Housing and a property owner's office so that students looking for a place to live could come to the ITC as a central point of information and then have transportation to look at those opportunities. These spaces could also potentially provide a revenue stream for the facility depending upon how arrangements with the University work.
5. An airport shuttle is seen as desirable.
6. Convenient parking could help support a medical campus shuttle from the ITC.
7. Later this evening at 6:00 p.m., Todd has arranged for a number of student drivers and students to meet with the Architects to further discuss the center.

Meeting Five – GREAT Riders' Meeting

Attendees:

Deloris Hart	Rider
Charles Shiver	Rider
Geraldine Teel	Transit Secretary, GREAT
Nancy Harrington	Transit Manager, GREAT
Laird Pylkas	Wendel Duchscherer
Ken Mayer	MMPA

Items discussed:

The purpose of this meeting was to allow riders who attended voice their comments on the ITC. The rider survey taken by the City was also reviewed. Some of the comments from riders included:

1. Protection from break-ins to vending machines.
2. Provide bus shelters at all bus stops.
3. Consider a place of worship or fellowship in the center.
4. Consider an information booth.
5. Look at the possibility for a Social Services drop-off box or a library book drop-off box.

6. Provide internet and television capability in waiting rooms.
7. Make sure the facility is clean and safe.
8. Look at a utility bill pay desk as an option.
9. Consider providing an ATM.

Meeting Six – East Carolina University Students and Others (6:00 p.m.)

Attendees:

Todd Johnson	East Carolina University
Nancy Harrington	Transit Manager, GREAT
Wood Davidson	Interim Director of ECU Transit Authority
Laird Pylkas	Wendel Duchscherer
Ken Mayer	Moser Mayer Phoenix Associates
President	East Carolina Student Body
Various Drivers	Student Transit Authority

Items Discussed:

Ken Mayer gave an overview of the project with its purpose and progress to-date and explained that the purpose of this evening's meeting was to gather input from students about what amenities and other things could be incorporated in the ITC to enhance their bus system and attract students.

1. One item of discussion related to the difference in operating hours of the two systems. East Carolina's runs twenty plus hours per day on average while the GREAT system's hours are much more limited. Discussions will need to take place between the two systems to look for better overlap so that the GREAT system can be leveraged and work better with the East Carolina System.
2. There was conversation about the comfort level of students riding with certain members of the general public on the GREAT system. Conversely, Todd Johnson noted that many of the complaints that are received about bus riders are actually about students so there is learning needed on the part of both the general public and students about whom their fellow riders are. This should lead to better compatibility. Safety is the #1 concern.
3. Discussion centered on what kinds of amenities would attract students to the center. The initial conversation was that the students have everything they need on campus and there are limited things that would attract them to use the transportation center other than simply for transportation. However, as the discussion evolved, several ideas came up.
 - a. A conference room, function room, banquet room that could be rented and used by both community groups and student groups in the center would be helpful.
 - b. A mini mart.
 - c. A food court that focused on international foods that are not available on campus and that perhaps has more of a farmer's market feel to it would be something that could not be experienced on campus. It would be attractive to both the community at large and students.
4. Todd Johnson reported that the University was continuing to expand westward and as this occurs, the proposed location for the ITC (which is west of campus) will become more and more

in the center of campus and could, in the future, become a major hub for the campus system. Factoring in the connections to the medical campus, the transportation center could, in fact, become an integral part of the University and its transportation system.

5. Todd reiterated the commitment by the University to work with the City on the center and noted that as the project evolves, future meetings with hopefully a broader cross section of students would be held to gain their input and thoughts.

Meeting Seven – Sept. 18, 2007 – Public Transportation and Parking Commission

Attendees:

Members of the Public Transportation and Parking Commission	
Laird Pylkas	Wendel Duchscherer
Ken Mayer	Moser Mayer Phoenix Associates

Note: This was an official public meeting with recorded minutes. This summary only addresses key ITC points made and discussion.

Ken Mayer opened the agenda items with an overview of the project process and the work done in the meetings the previous day. Some of the specific items discussed are outlined below:

1. There was concern over the “no show” of the taxis operators. However, Ken and Laird both pointed out that their needs are fairly straightforward and can be anticipated without their input if necessary.
2. Concern was expressed over the amount of parking requested by the Police. This will need to be looked at in the context of other available parking downtown.
3. Accessibility issues were brought up and Ken reinforced the conversation held with PATS about making the ITC “excessively accessible”.
4. Church and State issues will likely prevent the incorporation of the worship space that was requested by one of the riders.
5. The collaboration between the University and the City and those discussions being positive was reiterated. Discussions will need to continue to be held at higher levels of both the University and the City to make sure that this continues. Other higher education institutions were discussed such as Pitt Community College and the potential need to link their students to the University. It was also noted that Shaw University in Raleigh is developing distance learning centers around the state with one slated for Greenville that could tie in to a location near the ITC. The link to the medical center and medical campus was also seen as important.

Meeting Eight – Steering Committee

Attendees:

Peg Gemperline	Chairwoman, Public Transportation & Parking Commission
Bob Thompson	Chairman, PATS
Thom Moton	Assistant City Manager
Elvis Latiolais	General Manager, Carolina Trailways
Mike Kozak	Assistant Director, NCDOT/PTD
Nancy Harrington	Transit Manager, GREAT
Todd Johnson	Interim Vice Provost for Student Affairs
Laird Pylkas	Wendel Duchscherer
Ken Mayer	Moser Mayer Phoenix Associates

The purpose of the Steering Committee meeting was to review what had happened in the previous meetings and discuss the next steps for the project. Ken opened the meeting by giving an overview of the major issues to-date.

1. The changes by GREAT from the previous study, not to include administration and drivers' facilities in the ITC was noted.
2. Todd Johnson brought the group up-to-date on the current status of the ECU strategic plan. He noted that there were two components of that plan that impacted the ITC. The first is the University's role in economic development and the second is its commitment to service to the region. Accordingly, he believes that the University's involvement in the center will be greater than simply providing a single bay for their buses to stop. Todd summarized the current status of the master plan. He anticipates selecting a planning firm in October but the plan will continue to emphasize the University's westward expansion. In fact, they have already made a preliminary decision to place their next academic building in a location west of the main campus. Part of the master plan will also include a series of transit studies; one looking at logistics and efficiencies within the Student Transportation Authority, another will look at a parking and transit component of the master plan. All of this will potentially impact the ITC.
3. A suggestion was made to include a children's play corner in the ITC which could be sponsored by East Carolina's Child Development program. The Community Room that has been suggested by a number of people was also seen as positive.
4. Discussion was then held regarding funding issues. Mike Kozak reported that around the state people are having to evaluate how transportation centers fit into their community. This has been the case in Raleigh, Wilmington and Charlotte. The ITC site selection is more than picking a single location for the center. It involves looking at land use planning and potential development around the center once it's developed. What you don't want to do is impact negatively future or ongoing development by the placement of the transportation center. Funding will be a public/private partnership. Timing issues will be critical.
5. Thom Moton mentioned that a Math and Science Academy for Junior and Senior high school students which would include boarding students is being studied and could have some relationship to the ITC.
6. Mike Kozak reiterated that rail would likely not happen during the life of the project. It would be twenty-five to thirty years out so not to get too caught up in the location of rail. Mike also mentioned that one of the advantages that Charlotte and Wilmington had were that State funds

were available for land purchases at the time but that fund is empty. The FTA typically funds only the land that you need for the center. Another agency can buy and bank the land and that could then be used as the local share.

7. It was noted that the chemical plant which is in a location being considered may move but on a five year plan as opposed to something earlier.
8. Thom Moton agreed to ask the City to look into the ownership of the Church property but he believes that was currently being renovated, having been purchased.
9. It was noted that the Redevelopment Commission had been looking at a downtown theater and that could possibly be a co-location partner for the center.
10. Mike Kozak noted that the focus should be on siting the core transportation component then let land use and other development ideas flow for potential co-located facilities such as the East Carolina Science Museum on adjacent property.

Meeting Nine – Planning and Public Works

Attendees:

Wayne Harrison	City Planning
Harry Hamilton, Jr.	City Planning
David Brown	City Engineer
Ken Jackson	Operations Manager
Carl Reese	Urban Development Planner
Nancy Harrington	Transit Manager, City of Greenville GREAT
Mike Kozak	Assistant Director, NCDOT/PTD
Laird Pylkas	Wendel Duchscherer
Ken Mayer	Moser Mayer Phoenix Associates

The purpose of this meeting was to focus on the specific areas being considered for sites and getting any feedback in terms of technical engineering and other issues related to the sites.

1. Planning representatives gave an overview of the Tenth St. Connector status. It was reported that the project is currently in the first and second phase of preliminary design studies. The best case would show right-of-way acquisition in 2009 and construction beginning in 2010. The project will include dedicated bus lines that will link the University, the Center City and the Medical Center along this connector. There are one or two key decisions to be made with rail crossings that will impact the final decision.
2. Another project underway is the streetscape of the Evans St. right-of-way. It was also noted that there are two projects currently being looked at along Reade Circle, one on either side of Evans St. One is a high end student housing project that will use a transit oriented design approach. The other is more of a mixed use with condominium, office and some retail.
3. It was noted that the underground utilities in the areas being considered are old and will likely need upgrading.
4. It was also noted that there are historic district overlay issues that need to be considered. The Ficklen Tobacco Building, for example, is a national register listed building and Dickinson Avenue is a historic district. There was some discussion about the U. N. X. Chemical site and its redevelopment potential. One concern there would obviously be Brownfield and contamination issues.

5. It was noted that property values are rising rapidly and are approaching a million dollars per acre along Reade Circle. Some funding opportunities include potential cleanup grants from EPA. It was also discussed that the Redevelopment Commission, if funding were available, could buy the property, clean it up and then resell it or bank it for the ITC construction. The role of ECU in land acquisition will also need to be looked at. They could purchase the land then lease it to the City, for example.
6. The final portion of the meeting was a discussion of major next steps. The design team's next steps are to gather information on the two general areas identified as the potential site and develop capacity diagrams showing what those sites could actually hold if acquired. At the same time, a design team will develop a program summary for the major transportation elements to go in the center. The City needs to follow up on several key issues: The University's role in the project; and what other potential users should be included; and what are potential land acquisition and funding strategies.

Please notify the writer of any changes to this summary.

Summary prepared by: Kenneth C. Mayer, Jr., AIA, LEED AP
 Moser Mayer Phoenix Associates

C: All Attendees